Validation of the Interreligious Forms of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRSi-7, CRSi-14, and CRSi-20): Salience of Religion among Selected Youth in the Philippines

Fides del Castillo [1,*]**, Clarence Darro del Castillo** [2]**, Marie Antoinette Aliño** [3]**, Rene Nob** [4]**, Michael Ackert** [5] **and Gregory Ching** [6]

1   Theology and Religious Education Department, De La Salle University, Manila 1004, Philippines
2   Administration Office, Lumina Foundation for Integral Human Development, Calamba City 4027, Philippines; cdbdelcastillo@gmail.com
3   College of Arts, Sciences and Education, St. Paul University Quezon City, Quezon City 1112, Philippines; maalino@spuqc.edu.ph
4   Psychology Department, De La Salle University, Manila 1004, Philippines; rene.nob@dlsu.edu.ph
5   Department of Psychology, University of Fribourg, 1700 Fribourg, Switzerland; michael.ackert@unifr.ch
6   Graduate School of Educational Leadership & Development, Fu Jen Catholic University, New Taipei City 24205, Taiwan; 094478@mail.fju.edu.tw
*   Correspondence: fides.delcastillo@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract: The presence of different religions and the freedom of people to navigate the religious space shows that religion in the Philippines is not a monolithic entity. This study validated three versions of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRSi-7, -14, and -20) which propose an adequate assessment tool for the diversity of religious belief systems co-existing in Philippine society. The sample (N = 514) was drawn from the young population of the country in an online survey. Descriptive statistics and Cronbach's alpha values were calculated for the five subscales (ideology, intellect, experience, private and public practice) of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale. The factor structure of the interreligious Centrality of Religiosity Scale was tested using confirmatory factor analysis. The results show that CRSi-7 denotes internal consistency while CRSi-14 and CRSi-20 indicate good internal consistency. Models of CRSi-7, -14, and -20 show a good global fit. Despite two models of the CRSi-20 being identical in fit, the researchers defer to the CRSi-20 model with correlated factors since it is a simpler model. All versions of the CRSi demonstrate a valid and reliable measure for the centrality of religiosity in the Philippines and support the usefulness of the CRS for the study of religiosity.

1. Introduction

Religion, conceptualized as "systems of significance that are grounded in beliefs about the sacred (individual aspect) and realized within broader religious context (institutional)" (Talik 2013, p. 146) is "of the utmost importance to many people, and many fascinating behaviors are performed in its name" (Hood et al. 2009, p. 1). As shown by the results of numerous empirical studies, a person's faith is an integral part of his or her human existence (Koenig 2012). Religion plays a key role in searching for meaning and a sense of life (Nakonz and Shik 2009). It can also be a source of comfort and closeness to God (Hechanova et al. 2015) and other people (Hechanova and Waelde 2017).

Moreover, during difficult times, believers can find comfort in the abiding presence of the divine or sacred (Rilveria 2018), collaborate with God in problem-solving (Del Castillo and Alino 2020; Pargament et al. 2000), and ask for God's help (Rilveria 2018).

While there are specific measures for the cognition, affect, and behavior of religious persons, this paper explores the centrality of religious meanings in personality. Specifically, the researchers looked into the religious construct-system of selected youth in the Philippines and how religion influences their subjective experience and behavior. Youth religiosity is of special interest to the researchers because it is during the period of adolescence that religion can become an asset for positive development (Good et al. 2011). As a mediator, religion can provide the youth with different contexts for identity formation. Hardy and King (2019) explain that as an ideological context, it provides the youth with a belief system upon which they can ground their identity. As a social context, religion presents the youth with opportunities to practice living their beliefs, and to observe others doing so as well (i.e., "spiritual mentors"). As a spiritual context, religion offers the youth experiences of spiritual transcendence—that is, connection to something beyond themselves, such as divinity and their religious community (p. 247).

Baring et al. (2018) assert the religiosity/spirituality is a probable factor for psychosocial adjustment among the young. Higher levels of religiosity/spirituality contribute to more satisfying relationships, more academic success, greater well-being, and greater civic engagement (p. 172).

Additionally, this study was initiated and completed while the world is mired in a global pandemic. The novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) is still a new and inadequately understood upper respiratory infectious disease, with a rate of mortality that is high enough to have killed over 500,000 people to date globally (Baker et al. 2020, para. 1). Aside from being a virulent disease, COVID-19 also strained the religious beliefs and practices of people. Baker et al. (2020) note that demand for religious ritual, comfort, and support is presumably increased by the pandemic, while simultaneously the available supply of religion is drastically decreased. Hence, a measure of the centrality of religion will benefit researchers interested in the efficacy of religion to people coping with a major life stressor. More importantly, the data garnered from the instrument can shed light on the practicality of religion among young believers who are caught in the maelstrom of a largescale health crisis.

1.1. The Philippines and the Filipino Youth

The Philippines is a predominantly Catholic country. A critical survey of the Christianization of the Philippines shows that the Catholic Church grew from the personal religion of the indigenous people. Before the arrival of the Spanish Catholic missionaries on the Philippine archipelago, the indigenous people already had a worldview and religion of their own. Despite numerous challenges on evangelization, the Catholic missionaries succeeded. The Catholic Church thrived in the Philippines and became the dominant religion (Del Castillo 2018). In one of his messages to Filipino Catholics, John (1981) said that the Philippine nation is deserving of particular honor since, from the beginning of its Christianization, from the moment that Magellan planted the Cross in Cebu [province] on 15 April 1521, all through the centuries, its people have remained true to the Christian faith. In an achievement that remains unparalleled in history, the message of Christ took root in the hearts of the people within a very brief period, and the Church was thus strongly implanted in this nation of seven thousand islands and numerous tribal and ethnic communities (para. 2).

Out of 101 million Filipinos, there are around 80 million who profess the Catholic faith (Philippine Statistics Authority 2017). Macaraan (2019) observes that the Filipinos' sociocultural normative and lifeworld is deeply imbued with Catholic cosmologies and expressions. Birth until death and significant life moments in between are associated with important Catholic rites and rituals, particularly sacraments (p. 106).

Since a quarter of the Philippine population is composed of the youth, it is a fertile ground for research on religion and the young. Although there is no state religion, most Filipinos are religious (Philippines: Society and Culture 2011). The Filipino youth, as stipulated in Republic Act 8044, refers to

people whose ages range from fifteen (15) to thirty (30) years old (Youth in Nation Building Act 1995). From the total population in the Philippines, there are 15.9 million Filipino youth who are 15 to 22 years of age and almost 13.6 million who are 23 to 30 years old (Arceo 2018, p. 1). The median age in the Philippines was 24.3 years old (Philippine Statistics Authority 2017).

1.2. Religious Diversity in the Philippines

The dominance of the Catholic religion in the Philippines, however, does not equate to a lack of religious diversity. Various religious groups and denominations are actively present in the religious sphere, namely "Christian Churches, Evangelical, Church of Christ, and Philippine Independent Church. Also, roughly five percent of the population is Muslim" (Philippines: Society and Culture 2011, p. 4). Chinese Buddhism, although a minority religion, also thrives in the country. As of 2011, there are 37 Chinese Buddhist temples and seven Chinese Buddhist Schools in the Philippines (Dy 2012). There is also a temple in Manila (capital of the Philippines) that serves as a religious center for Hindus (Hutter 2012).

The presence of different religions and the freedom of people to navigate the religious space show that religion in the Philippines is not a monolithic entity. Macasaet (2009) observes that there are Catholic youths who, after encountering the communal and highly experiential modes of spirituality among charismatic Christian Churches, have chosen to convert. Indeed, "charismatic movements and evangelical churches have become noteworthy as religious spaces for finding personal meaning" (Sapitula and Cornelio 2014, p. 2). Acknowledging the reality of religious syncretism, Dy (2012) reports that, "in this predominantly Catholic country, most of those who practice popular Buddhism are also baptized Catholics who may go to [a Catholic] church regularly" (p. 246). However, due to the dominance of the Catholic Church in the country, Hutter (2012) also notes that "while there is no direct interference on the religious level, the dominant Christian culture (including schools run by Christian organizations) leaves its impact on Sindhis by converting some of them to Christianity, thus decreasing the number of Hindu Sindhis as a result" (p. 363)

Recognizing the religious diversity in the Philippines, this study operationalizes the term religion to refer to human acts that involve beliefs, practices, and rituals related to the transcendent, where the transcendent is God, Allah, HaShem, or a Higher Power in Western religious traditions, or to Brahman, manifestations of Brahman, Buddha, Dao, or ultimate truth/reality in Eastern traditions. This often involves the mystical or supernatural. Religions usually have specific beliefs about life after death and rules about conduct within a social group. Religion is a multidimensional construct that includes beliefs, behaviors, rituals, and ceremonies that may be held or practiced in private or public settings but are in some way derived from established traditions that developed over time within a community. Religion is also an organized system of beliefs, practices, and symbols designed (a) to facilitate closeness to the transcendent and (b) to foster an understanding of one's relationship and responsibility to others in living together in a community. (Koenig 2012, pp. 2–3)

Although the majority of Filipinos are affiliated with the Catholic Church, there is a need to veer away from sweeping generalizations and declare that the Philippines is a Catholic country, as well as primarily describe Filipinos using Catholic constructs. The portrayal of Filipinos who believe in a transcendent or ultimate truth/reality can be nuanced through a measuring instrument that significantly contributes to data collection in studies that take the spirituality/religiosity variable into account (Esperandio et al. 2019). More importantly, such a psychological measure should be interreligious in scope.

1.3. Researchers on Religiosity in the Philippines

Local scholarship on religion and the Filipino youth point to robust descriptions of the religious orientations of the young (Baring 2018). However, empirical studies such as the National Filipino Catholic Youth Study 2014 (CBCP-ECY and CEAP 2014) only formed baseline data for population profile regarding religion rather than investigate the underlying dimensions that characterize respondents'

notions of religion (Baring et al. 2018). Indeed, checking the religious affiliation and attendance at religious activities is not enough. It is necessary to evaluate the extent to which religiosity occupies a central place in the life of the individual (Esperandio et al. 2019). This echoes the assertion of Huber (2007) that only if the religious construct-system is situated in a central position that religious beliefs can be powerful enough to influence subjective experience and behavior.

To address the knowledge gap on the salience of religion among Filipino youth, the researchers explored in this paper the degree of religiosity of selected young Filipinos and the relevance of religious beliefs in their daily life. Since there is no culturally adapted scale to measure the centrality of religion among the Filipino youth, the researchers communicated with the author of the scale who permitted the use of the 20-item interreligious Centrality of Religiosity Scale or CRSi-20. Huber and Huber (2012) describe the Centrality of Religiosity Scale as:

> A measure of the centrality, importance, or salience of religious meanings in personality. It has been developed by Huber and has yet been applied in more than 100 studies in sociology of religion, psychology of religion, and religious studies in 25 countries with a total of more than 100,000 participants. The largest single application is in the global Religion Monitor with representative samples in 21 countries. (p. 711)

While there are different versions of the CRS in 20 languages with norm values for 21 countries (Huber and Huber 2012), the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRSi-20) has not been validated in the Philippine milieu and utilized to illuminate the salience of religion in the personality of the Filipino youth. By validating the CSR, the researchers can ascertain that the measure does not carry delimiting objectives or contexts that are very specific to its design and development. Additionally, the CRSi-20 will allow the researchers to answer the following questions: (1) What CRSi version is valid in the Philippine context? (2) What is the position of the religious construct-system among selected Filipino youth? and (3) How does the centrality of religion influence the selected Filipino youths' subjective experience and behavior?

2. The Centrality of Religiosity Scale

The centrality of religiosity scale's versions of the present validation are the CRSi-7, CRSi-14, and CRSi-20 with the focus on a group of Filipinos within the age range of 16–30 years old. The scale is interreligious in scope, which is appropriate considering the diversity of religious belief systems co-existing in Philippine society. Huber and Huber (2012) describe the CRS as an instrument that:

> . . . measures the general intensities of five theoretical defined core dimensions of religiosity. The dimensions of public practice, private practice, religious experience, ideology, and intellectual dimensions can together be considered as representative for the total of religious life. From a psychological perspective, the five core-dimensions can be seen as channels or modes in which personal religious constructs are shaped and activated. The activation of religious constructs in personality can be regarded as a valid measure of the degree of religiosity of an individual. The CRS thus derives from the five-dimensional measures a combined measure of the centrality of religiosity which is suitable also for interreligious studies (p. 710)

Elucidating further the five hypothetical basic dimensions of religiosity from a sociological perspective, Huber and Huber (2012) explain that the intellectual dimension refers to the social expectation that religious people have some knowledge of religion and that they can explain their views on transcendence, religion, and religiosity.

> The dimension of ideology refers to the social expectation that religious individuals have beliefs regarding the existence and the essence of a transcendent reality and the relation between the transcendence and human. The dimension of public practice refers to the social

expectation that religious individuals belong to religious communities which are manifested in the public participation in religious rituals and communal activities. The dimension of private practice [which] refers to the social expectation that religious individuals devote themselves to the transcendence in individualized activities and rituals in private space. The dimension of religious experience refers to the social expectation that religious individuals have—some kind of direct contact to an ultimate reality (pp. 714–15)

Lastly, Huber and Huber (2012) assert that the CRS rests on two assumptions, "(1) The measurement of the general intensity of the five core-dimensions allows a representative estimation of the frequency and intensity of the activation of the personal religious construct system and (2) The probability of a central position of the religious construct-system in personality increases with the overall intensity and frequency of its activation" (p. 715).

The CRS has three validated versions for Abrahamic religions: five items (CRS-5), 10 items (CRS-10), and 15 items (CRS-15). However, for Buddhists, Hindus, and Muslims specific modifications of the CRS were developed to reflect their openness for polytheistic concepts and practices. Hence the term "God or something divine" in Items 02, 05, 10, and 15 of the CRS were extended to "God, deities, or something divine". "This enhances the scope of personal religious constructs that can be measured in the ideological and experiential dimensions." (Huber and Huber 2012, p. 719). These changes are reflected in CRSi-7, CRSi-14, and CRSi-20 which bring the total number of CRS versions to six.

The Centrality of Religiosity Scale Versions in Different Contexts

The CRS has already been validated and applied in numerous studies. However, it is still noteworthy to look at current validations of the CRS versions drawn from different religious and sociocultural contexts. Esperandio et al. (2019) validated the Brazilian version CRS-10BR and CRS-5BR. They concluded that the CRS-10BR captures the CRS full construct. However, they also concluded that the CRS-5BR has demonstrated acceptable fit indices as well, it is also considered suitable for use in the Brazilian population when the context demands simpler and faster data collection (p. 11). Researchers Lee and Kuang (2020) also validated the CRS in the Hong Kong context and found out that "the single-factor solution of five items (CRS-5) had better fit indices than the seven-item version (CRSi-7), which, in turn, was better than CRS-15 with a five-factor solution" (p. 1). In Germany, Demmrich (2020) validated the CRS to measure Baha'i religiosity and discovered that "the CRSi-20 for Baha'is offers the first reliable and valid measurements of Baha'i religiosity, being at the same time capable of taking the emic perspective fully into account while maintaining the possibility of cross-religious comparisons" (p. 1). Abbasi et al. (2019) translated and cross-language validated the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CSR) from English (source language) to Urdu (target language). They discovered that the "Urdu translation of CRS has satisfactory alpha reliability ($\alpha = 0.77$) and the three subscales [renamed] "exclusive," "inclusive" and "collective" religious beliefs significantly correlated with each other". Additionally, "confirmatory factor analysis's result revealed that the final model of CRS in the Urdu language with 11 items and three dimensions is the best fit for Pakistani culture to assess the level of religiosity" (p. 319). Gheorghe (2019) validated a Romanian version of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS-15) and reported that the "validated Romanian version of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS-15) is a valid and reliable measure in detecting the centrality of religiosity" (p. 8). In the Philippines, Batara (2018) utilized the CRS-15 to determine the relationship between religiosity as a predictor and the willingness to help an out-group. That author discovered that "total religiosity of CRS-15 resulted in very good reliability at 0.902" and that "CRS-15 was also correlated with religious identity and the importance of religion in daily life" (p. 75). Moreover, "among the dimensions of religion, it is the public practice that mostly facilitates helping behavior" (p. 78).

3. Method

3.1. Participants

A total of 514 Filipino youths (64.4% females, 35.6% males) participated in the present study. The mean age of the respondents was 19.25 years, with a standard deviation of 2.21 years. Most of the participants are Filipino Catholics (N = 430 or 83.66%), while the rest are affiliated with other Christian denominations (N = 55 or 10.7%), and other religions (N = 29 or 5.64%).

3.2. Instrument

The Centrality of Religiosity of Filipino Youth was measured using the Interreligious Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRSi) versions CRSi-7, CRSi-14, and CRSi-20 (Huber and Huber 2012). CRSi has five subscales: intellect, ideology, public practice, private practice, and religious experience, whereby two of the core dimensions, i.e., private practice and religious experience asses two different religious patterns. These patterns are described as interactive and participative by the author of the scale. For example, prayer is indicative of the interactive and meditation of participative pattern. The same applies to the items of religious experience. This leads to each pair of items on these two subscales in the CRSi-7. In the CRSi-14 the number of items is multiplied by two. Finally, in the CRSi-20 the core dimension of ideology, intellect, and public practice and religious experience receive one more item each, and the private practice receives two more, resulting in a total of 20 items. The CRSi uses 5-point frequency (very often, often, occasionally, rarely, and never) and intensity (very much so, quite a bit, moderately, not very much, and not at all) response scales (Huber and Huber 2012, p. 716). CRSi-7, CRSi-14, and CRSi-20 subscales, sample items, and the number of items per subscales are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. CRSi-7, CRSi-14, & CRSi-20 Subscales & Sample Items.

CRSi Versions & Subscales		Sample Items	Number of Items
CRSi-7	Intellect	How often do you think about religious issues?	1
	Ideology	To what extent do you believe that God or something divine exists?	1
	Public Practice	How often do you take part in religious services?	1
	Private Practice	How often do you pray?	2
	Religious Experience	How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine intervenes in your life?	2
CRSi-14	Intellect	How interested are you in learning more about religious topics?	2
	Ideology	To what extent do you believe in an afterlife—e.g., immortality of the soul, resurrection of the dead, or reincarnation?	2
	Public Practice	How important is it to take part in religious services?	2
	Private Practice	How important is personal prayer for you?	4
	Religious Experience	How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that you are touched by divine power?	4
CRSi-20	Intellect	How often do you keep yourself informed about religious questions through radio, television, internet, newspapers, or books?	3
	Ideology	In your opinion, how probable is it that a higher power really exists?	3
	Public Practice	How important is it for you to be connected to a religious community?	3
	Private Practice	How often do you pray spontaneously when inspired by daily situations?	6
	Religious Experience	How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine is present?	5

Note: CRS–Centrality of Religiosity Scale. CRSi–interreligious CRS.

3.3. Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations were calculated for the five subscales of the interreligious Centrality of Religiosity Scale. Measures of skewness and kurtosis are reported along with other descriptive statistic to define the distributions of the subscale scores. Cronbach's alpha is calculated for each of the subscales to establish internal consistency.

The factor structure of the interreligious Centrality of Religiosity Scale was tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). CFA was done using JASP (JASP Team 2020) to test Huber and Huber (2012) five-factor model, while normality of the data was assessed by examining the skewness and kurtosis of the distribution (Kline 2005). Results of the normality test indicated

that the values were within the accepted parameters of less than ±2.0 for skewness and ±7.0 for kurtosis (Cunningham 2008). The following fit indices and criteria were used to establish model fit: a non-significant chi-square, root-mean-square-error-of approximation (RMSEA) and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) < 0.08, and goodness of fit index (GFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) > 0.90 (Hair et al. 2014).

The model for the CRSi-7 is built around the Centrality of Religiosity which is defined as a latent variable with five reflective indicators each denoting one core dimension of the CRS. The starting model has uncorrelated residuals. The models of CRSi-14 and -20 are built around the five core dimensions which are correlated and receive each two (CRSi-14) or three (CRSi-20) reflective indicators each. CRSi-14 and CRSi-20 models with a second level factor with 5 reflective indicators of the core dimensions are tested as well.

In the process of model evaluation modification indices greater than $\chi^2 = 3.84$ per one degree of freedom are considered as a point of iterative model modification until the models fit the set-up global fit criteria.

4. Results

Means, standard deviations, skewness, kurtosis, and Cronbach's alpha were calculated for the three versions and subscales of the Centrality of Religiosity Interreligious as shown in Table 2. The results of CRSi-20 show that the Centrality of Religiosity has a mean score of 3.78 and a standard deviation of 0.75. It has a skewness measure of −0.89, which implies that it is slightly skewed. The kurtosis value of 0.52 indicates that the distribution is leptokurtic (i.e., more peaked than the normal distribution and has fatter tails). It has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.95 which indicates good internal consistency, while the results of CRSi-14 show that the Centrality of Religiosity has a mean score and standard deviation of 3.79 and 0.73 respectively. Skewness measure of –0.86 suggests that it is slightly skewed, while the kurtosis of 0.56 indicates that the distribution is leptokurtic. Cronbach's alpha of 0.92 indicates good internal consistency. Lastly, the results of CRSi-7 showed the Centrality of Religiosity has a mean score of 3.65 and a standard deviation of 0.70. Skewness measure of −0.57 implies that it is also slightly skewed, while the kurtosis of 0.33 indicates that it is also leptokurtic. In the three versions of CRSi, the skewness measures of ideology are −1.64, −1.47, and −1.87 respectively. While private practice has skewness measures of −1.14, −1.15, and −0.72. They imply that the scores for the subscales are concentrated on the higher values and that the distribution is moderately skewed. Kurtosis measures of ideology ($Ku_{20} = 3$, $Ku_{14} = 2.18$, and $Ku_7 = 2.99$) indicate that the distributions are more peaked than the normal distributions with fatter tails. For private practice, the kurtosis measures in CRSi 20 ($Ku = 0.9$) and CRSi 14 ($Ku = 0.95$) showed that the distribution is leptokurtic, while in CRSi 7 ($Ku = −0.018$) the distribution is less peaked than the normal distribution with lighter tails. We also tested for multivariate normality of CRSi-7, CRSi-14, and CRSi-20 using Mardia's test (Mardia 1970). Results indicate that, in all CRSi versions, there are violations in the assumption of multivariate normality for both multivariate skewness (ps < 0.001) and multivariate kurtosis (ps < 0.001). To address such, all CFA analyses were bootstrapped to 1000 samples. (Yung and Bentler 1996). Cronbach's alpha of 0.82 denotes internal consistency.

Since the goal of this study is to validate the three versions of the Interreligious Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRSi), the researchers tested seven CRSi measurement models using confirmatory factor analysis, specifically the Maximum Likelihood algorithm. Hereon, these models will be identified as follows: Model 1 is the single-factor CRSi-7, Model 2 is the single-factor CRSi-14, Model 3 is CRSi-14 with five factors, Model 4 is CRSi-14 with five factors and one higher-order factor, Model 5 is a single-factor CRSi-20, Model 6 is CRSi-20 with five factors, and Model 7 is CRSi-20 with five factors and one higher-order factor.

Table 3 shows a summary of the fit indices for all seven models. The fit of these models is evaluated using a set of criteria in terms of fit indices. A model with a good fit is expected to be indicated by a non-significant chi-square, RMSEA, and SRMR < 0.08, and GFI, CFI, and TLI > 0.90 (Hair et al. 2014).

As expected, all chi-square values are statistically significant due to the large sample size. Considering the rest of the indices, it seems that, even after covarying the four pairs of residuals, the data still does not fit Model 1 (single-factor CSRi-7) well enough.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the interreligious CRS.

Centrality of Religiosity Scale Versions		M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's α
CRSi-20	Total score	3.78	0.75	−0.89	0.52	0.95
	Intellect	3.42	0.82	−0.3	−0.23	0.76
	Ideology	4.34	0.74	−1.64	3	0.77
	Public Practice	3.53	0.94	−0.46	−0.41	0.78
	Private Practice	3.93	0.89	−1.14	0.9	0.87
	Religious Experience	3.66	0.97	−0.66	−0.11	0.93
CRSi-14	Total score	3.79	0.73	−0.86	0.56	0.92
	Intellect	3.6	0.82	−0.48	−0.03	n.a.
	Ideology	4.29	0.81	−1.47	2.18	n.a.
	Public Practice	3.39	0.92	−0.19	−0.48	n.a.
	Private Practice	4.06	0.89	−1.15	0.95	n.a.
	Religious Experience	3.61	0.97	−0.57	−0.25	n.a.
CRSi-7	Total score	3.65	0.7	−0.57	0.33	0.82
	Intellect	3.27	0.91	−0.08	−0.29	n.a.
	Ideology	4.52	0.88	−1.87	2.99	n.a.
	Public Practice	2.88	1.04	0.38	−0.34	n.a.
	Private Practice	3.9	0.99	−0.72	−0.18	n.a.
	Religious Experience	3.67	0.95	−0.6	−0.1	n.a.

Note: N = 514. M–mean, SD–standard deviation; n.a.–not applicable. CRS–Centrality of Religiosity Scale.

Table 3. Measures of Goodness of Fit Indices for all Seven Models.

Centrality of Religiosity Scale		X^2	df	RMSEA (90% CI)	SRMR	GFI	CFI	TLI
CRSi-7	Model1	88.60	12	0.11 (0.09–0.13)	0.05	0.95	0.93	0.88
CRSi-14	Model 2	455.07	73	0.10 (0.09–0.11)	0.05	0.88	0.91	0.89
	Model 3	289.21	65	0.08 (0.07–0.09)	0.06	0.92	0.95	0.93
	Model 4	367.03	70	0.09 (0.08–0.10)	0.06	0.90	0.93	0.91
CRSi-20	Model 5	1044.21	166	0.10 (0.10–11)	0.06	0.81	0.88	0.87
	Model 6	585.34	156	0.07 (0.07–0.08)	0.07	0.89	0.94	0.93
	Model 7	534.37	143	0.07 (0.07–0.08)	0.07	0.89	0.94	0.93

Note: Model 1—single-factor CRSi-7; Model 2—single-factor CRSi14; Model 3—five-factor CRSi-14; Model 4—five-factor CRSi-14 with one higher-order factor; Model 5—single-factor CRSi-20, Model 6—five-factor CRSi-20, and Model 7—five-factor CRSi-20 with one higher-order factor. X^2—Chi-square; RMSEA—root-mean-square-error-of approximation; SRMR—standardized root mean square residual; GFI—goodness of fit index; CFI—comparative fit index; and TLI—Tucker–Lewis index.

Among the seven models, CRSi-14 Models 3 and 4, as well as CRSi-20 Models 6 and 7, all show a good fit. Specifically, Model 3 (RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.06, GFI = 0.92, CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.93) is slightly better than Model 4 (RMSEA = 0.09, SRMR = 0.06, GFI = 0.90, CFI = 0.93, TLI = 0.91). CRSi-20 Models 6 and 7 (RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.07, GFI = 0.89, CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.93) are identical in fit. Given the listed goodness of fit indices both these models are supported with identical fit measures, we decided to defer to the simpler Model 6.

Table 4 shows the factor loadings for Model 3. It should be noted that two pairs of residuals were covaried in the model. Residuals for Items 10 and 8, of the private practice factor, were covaried ($\delta_{x_{10}x_8} = 0.60$, $z = 10.11$, $p < 0.001$). The same was done for Items 18 and 19, of the factor, experience, ($\delta_{x_{18}x_{19}} = 0.19$, $z = 6.74$, $p < 0.001$). Items 8 and 10 pertain to individuals' frequency and value for meditation, respectively. On the other hand, Item 18 pertains to the frequency of feeling a sense of unison with everything, while Item 19 pertains to the frequency of feeling touched by divine power. All the items have loaded significantly in the different subscales. As for internal consistency within the factors in this model, private practice is acceptable ($\alpha = 0.78$), while experience excellent ($\alpha = 0.90$).

Table 4. Factor Loadings in Model 3, Five-Factor CRSi-14.

Factor	Item	Factor Loading	SE	z	p
Intellect	12. How often do you think about religious issues?	0.488	0.040	10.927	<0.001
	2. How interested are you in learning more about religious topics?	0.851	0.048	18.537	<0.001
Ideology	1. To what extent do you believe that God or something divine exists?	0.896	0.037	21.557	<0.001
	3. To what extent do you believe in an afterlife—e.g., immortality of the soul, resurrection of the dead, or reincarnation?	0.556	0.042	13.130	<0.001
Public Practice	11. How often do you take part in religious services?	0.516	0.046	11.766	<0.001
	4. How important is it to take part in religious services?	0.840	0.049	19.395	<0.001
Private Practice	9. How often do you pray?	0.764	0.042	19.812	<0.001
	10. How often do you meditate?	0.430	0.058	9.770	<0.001
	5. How important is personal prayer for you?	0.909	0.037	25.472	<0.001
	8. How important is meditation for you?	0.530	0.048	12.411	<0.001
Experience	13. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine intervenes in your life?	0.836	0.040	22.752	<0.001
	18. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that you are in one with all?	0.736	0.041	18.790	<0.001
	14. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine wants to show or reveal something to you?	0.900	0.039	25.589	<0.001
	19. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that you are touched by a divine power?	0.830	0.043	22.497	<0.001

Note: SE—standard error; z—obtained z value; p—probability value.

The CFA results showed that all the items have loaded significantly in their hypothesized factor ($p < 0.001$). This indicates that these items seem to be related to the underlying dimensions they are supposed to measure.

The factor loading of items that comprise CRSi-20 is found in Table 5. Similar to the previous model, these items are structured into five factors. For this specific model, four pairs of residuals were covaried. Similar to the five-factor CRSi-14, residuals of Items 10 and 8 ($\delta_{x_{10}x_8} = 0.54$, $z = 9.73$, $p < 0.001$), as well as Items 18 and 19 ($\delta_{x_{18}x_{19}} = 0.16$, $z = 6.54$, $p < 0.001$) were covaried. In addition, Items 12 and 15 of the factor, intellectual ($\delta_{x_{12}x_{15}} = 0.23$, $z = 7.14$, $p < 0.001$), and Items 9 and 5 of private practice ($\delta_{x_5x_9} = 0.13$, $z = 5.58$, $p < 0.001$) were also covaried. All the items have loaded significantly in the different subscales. As shown in Table 2, all subscales show acceptable reliability ranging from 0.76 to 0.93.

The correlation results between the subscales of CRSi-20 are shown in Table 6. The intellect is significant positively related to ideology ($r = 0.47, p < 0.01$), public practice ($r = 0.71, p < 0.01$), private practice ($r = 0.67, p < 0.01$), and religious experience ($r = 0.66, p < 0.01$). Ideology is significant positively related to public practice ($r = 0.57, p < 0.01$), private practice ($r = 0.64, p < 0.01$), and religious experience ($r = 0.65, p < 0.01$). Public practice is significant positively related to private practice ($r = 0.74, p < 0.01$), and religious experience ($r = 0.70, p < 0.01$). Lastly, private practice is significant positively related to religious experience ($r = 0.79, p < 0.01$).

The correlation results between the subscales of CRSi-14 are shown in Table 7. The intellect is significant positively related to ideology ($r = 0.46, p < 0.01$), public practice ($r = 0.66, p < 0.01$), private practice ($r = 0.59, p < 0.01$), and religious experience ($r = 0.62, p < 0.01$). Ideology is significant positively related to public practice ($r = 0.51, p < 0.01$), private practice ($r = 0.57, p < 0.01$), and religious experience ($r = 0.63, p < 0.01$). Public practice is significant positively related to private practice ($r = 0.62, p < 0.01$), and religious experience ($r = 0.61, p < 0.01$). Lastly, private practice is significant positively related to religious experience ($r = 0.69, p < 0.01$).

Table 5. Factor Loadings in Model 6, Five-Factor CRSi-20.

Factor	Item	Factor Loading	SE	z	p
Intellect	12. How often do you think about religious issues?	0.467	0.04	10.703	<0.001
	2. How interested are you in learning more about religious topics?	0.83	0.041	21.068	<0.001
	15. How often do you keep yourself informed about religious questions through radio, television, internet, newspapers, or books?	0.689	0.043	16.813	<0.001
Ideology	1. To what extent do you believe that God or something divine exists?	0.909	0.033	24.507	<0.001
	3. To what extent do you believe in an afterlife—e.g. immortality of the soul, resurrection of the dead, or reincarnation?	0.577	0.042	13.558	<0.001
	6. In your opinion, how probable is it that a higher power really exists?	0.695	0.034	17.09	<0.001
Public Practice	11. How often do you take part in religious services?	0.514	0.045	12.006	<0.001
	4. How important is it to take part in religious services?	0.874	0.04	24.32	<0.001
	7. How important is it for you to be connected to a religious community?	0.879	0.043	24.517	<0.001
	9. How often do you pray?	0.703	0.042	17.841	<0.001
	10. How often do you meditate?	0.482	0.057	11.283	<0.001
Private Practice	5. How important is personal prayer for you?	0.837	0.037	23.03	<0.001
	8. How important is meditation for you?	0.558	0.047	13.369	<0.001
	16. How often do you pray spontaneously when inspired by daily situations?	0.842	0.042	23.274	<0.001
	20. How often do you try to connect to the divine spontaneously when inspired by daily situations?	0.875	0.04	24.724	<0.001
	13. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine intervenes in your life?	0.825	0.039	22.607	<0.001
Experience	18. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that you are in one with all?	0.754	0.04	19.729	<0.001
	14. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine wants to show or reveal something to you?	0.877	0.039	24.911	<0.001
	19. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that you are touched by a divine power?	0.844	0.042	23.42	<0.001
	17. How often do you experience situations in which you have the feeling that God or something divine is present?	0.904	0.038	26.204	<0.001

Note: SE—standard error; *z*—obtained *z* value; *p*—probability value.

Table 6. Correlation Matrix of CRSi-20 Subscales.

Core Dimension	1	2	3	4
1. Intellect				
2. Ideology	0.47 **			
3. Public Practice	0.71 **	0.57 **		
4. Private Practice	0.67 **	0.64 **	0.74 **	
5. Religious Experience	0.66 **	0.65 **	0.70 **	0.79 **

Note: ** *p* < 0.01.

Table 7. Correlation Matrix of CRSi-14 Subscales.

Core Dimension	1	2	3	4
1. Intellect				
2. Ideology	0.46 **			
3. Public Practice	0.66 **	0.51 **		
4. Private Practice	0.59 **	0.57 **	0.62 **	
5. Religious Experience	0.62 **	0.63 **	0.61 **	0.69 **

Note: ** *p* < 0.01.

5. Discussion

The religiosity profile of the participants based on the results of CRSi-20 revealed that the majority of the participants were religious (N = 263 or 51.17%), others were highly religious (N = 232 or 45.13%) and a minority are not religious (N = 19 or 3.70%).

The initial confirmatory factor analyses of these models indicated poor fit. However, upon examining the modification indices, systematic variations in the residuals were identified and covaried. Considering that the current study intends to compare several models, it was decided that the covariation of residual be done for all plausible models. Hence, it can be argued that specific models

are empirically superior to the others and do not simply show good fit because they are only the models for which residuals were covaried for.

A model with a good fit is expected to be indicated by a non-significant chi-square, RMSEA, and SRMR < 0.08, and GFI, CFI, and TLI > 0.90 (Hair et al. 2014). Among the seven models, CRSi-14 Models 3 and 4, as well as CRSi-20 Models 6 and 7, all show a good fit. Specifically, Model 3 (RMSEA = 0.08, SRMR = 0.06, GFI = 0.92, CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.93) is slightly better than Model 4 (RMSEA = 0.09, SRMR = 0.06, GFI = 0.90, CFI = 0.93, TLI = 0.91). CRSi-20 Models 6 and 7 (RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.07, GFI = 0.89, CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.93) are identical in fit. Given that both these models are supported with identical fit measures, we decided to defer to the simpler Model 6.

Among the seven models that were tested, two models showed acceptable goodness of fit indices, namely, CRSi-14 Model 3 and CRSi-20 Model 6. Results of CFA for the five-factor CRSi-14 and five-factor CRSi-20 showed that all items are significant at 0.001 when tested on their hypothesized factors. It showed that the items are related to the factors that they are supposed to measure. All subscales show acceptable reliability ranging from 0.76 to 0.93.

To check the bivariate correlation of the CRSi subscales in all of its versions, Pearson *r* correlations were ran, which consistently showed that all factors of CRSi are positively correlated. The coefficients suggest these factors are associated with each other but can still be discriminated from one another. High knowledge of religion is related to high religious beliefs, public participation in religious rituals, devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces, and religious experiences/feelings, while low knowledge of religion is related to low religious beliefs, public participation in religious rituals, devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces, and religious experiences/feelings or vice versa. High religious belief is related to high public participation in religious rituals, devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces, and religious experiences/feelings, while low religious belief is related to low public participation in religious rituals, devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces, and religious experiences/feelings or vice versa. High public participation in religious rituals is related to high devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces, and religious experiences/feelings, while low public participation in religious rituals is related to low devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces, and religious experiences/feelings. High devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces is related to high religious experiences/feelings, while low devotion to religious activities/rituals in private spaces is related to low religious experiences/feelings or vice versa. The results established the convergent validity among the subscales.

6. Conclusions

The study validated the three versions of the CRSi by using samples from selected Filipino youth from the Philippines. The results showed that CRSi-14 Models 3 and 4, as well as CRSi-20 Models 6 and 7, show a good fit. Despite CRSi-20 Models 6 and 7 being identical in fit, the researchers defer to the CRSi-20 Model 6 (five factors) since it is a simpler model. In consonance with the findings of Demmrich (2020), the CRSi-20 is also a valid and reliable measure for the centrality of religiosity in the Philippines and support the usefulness of the CRS among Filipino youth. The RMSEA (which estimates how well the model matrix is adapted to the population matrix) showed that CRSi-20 (Models 6 and 7) with identical values of 0.07 demonstrated a fair fit. One possible explanation might be that the selected sample (Filipino youth) is a small number of the total Filipino population. Admittedly, this was a limitation of the study. Further studies might consider using larger samples.

Another contribution of the study is to illuminate (albeit to a limited extent) how religion influences the behavior and personality of selected Filipino youth who are struggling with a major life stressor like the COVID-19 pandemic. Dein et al. (2020) observe that:

> The pandemic has affected religious practice in significant ways, including the cancellation of live religious services, closing religious schools, canceling pilgrimages, and prohibiting group interactions during festivals and celebrations. A Pew Research report in March 2020 describes a change in peoples' religious habits during the pandemic. Over 50% of respondents

stated that they had prayed for an end to the spread of coronavirus, attended religious services in person less frequently, and watched religious services online or on TV instead of in-person. Collective worship has become difficult, online worship is increasing while private worship/prayer appears to have been considerably on the increase. (pp. 3–5)

Lee and Kuang (2020) recommended that studies be conducted to explore the linkage of the CRS and mental health. Reflecting on the call of Baker et al. (2020) to investigate how conditions of change and uncertainty, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, relate to private religious beliefs and practices, the researchers assert that based on the high mean scores on ideology (M = 4.34) (SD = 0.74) among selected Filipino youth, their views on the actuality and substance of a transcendent truth remained steadfast while navigating the unchartered waters of COVID-19. The results also support the assertion of Dein et al. (2020) that religious beliefs could offer comfort in relation to COVID-19.

Baker et al. (2020) observed that the pandemic changed religion by the suspension of in-person religious gatherings, and the corresponding need to engage in 'socially distanced' forms of interactive religious services and rituals. The researchers see this phenomenon as one of the possible causes for the low mean scores of the selected Filipino youth on the CSRi-20 public practice dimension (M = 3.53, SD = 0.94).

On the role of prayer, spirituality, and other religious practices play in coping with COVID-19 (Dein et al. 2020; Del Castillo 2020; Del Castillo and Castillo 2020), the researchers assert that private prayer is an important coping mechanism among selected Filipino youth as evidenced by the CSRi-20 private practice dimension scores (M = 3.93) (SD = 0.89). Most Filipino youth devote themselves to the transcendence in individualized activities and rituals in private space. This aligns with the findings of Del Castillo and Alino (2020) that the majority of Filipino youth communicate with God through personal prayers, especially during trying times.

References

Abbasi, Sadia Bano, Farhana Kazmi, Nisha Wilson, and Faria Khan. 2019. Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS) Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *MedCrave* 3: 319–24. Available online: https://medcraveonline.com/SIJ/SIJ-03-00193.pdf (accessed on 24 October 2020). [CrossRef]

Arceo, Carlo John. 2018. Situation of the Filipino Youth and Students. *Preprint*. [CrossRef]

Baker, Joseph, Gerardo Martí, Ruth Braunstein, Andrew L. Whitehead, and Grace Yukich. 2020. Religion in the Age of Social Distancing: How COVID-19 Presents New Directions for Research. *Sociology of Religion* 81: 357–70. [CrossRef]

Baring, Rito. 2018. Emerging Transitions in the Meaning of Religious Constructs: The Case of the Philippines. *Religions* 9: 387. [CrossRef]

Baring, Rito, Philip Joseph Sarmiento, Nestor Sibug, Paolo Lumanlan, Benito Bonus, Cristina Samia, and Stephen Reysen. 2018. Filipino College Students' Attitudes towards Religion: An Analysis of the Underlying Factors. *Religions* 9: 85. [CrossRef]

Batara, Jame Bryan. 2018. Public practice of religion as predictor of prosocial behavior. *Prism* 23: 73–81.

CBCP-ECY, and CEAP. 2014. *Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines-Episcopal Commission on Youth (CBCP-ECY) and Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines (CEAP)*. The National Filipino Catholic Youth Study 2014. Manila: CBCP-ECY and CEAP.

Cunningham, Everarda. 2008. *A Practical Guide to Structural Equation Modelling Using AMOS*. Melbourne: Statsline.

Dein, Simon, Kate Loewenthal, Christopher Alan Lewis, and Kenneth I. Pargament. 2020. COVID-19, mental health and religion: An agenda for future research. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 23: 1–9. [CrossRef]

Del Castillo, Fides. 2018. Perspectives on faith and culture in the Philippines, East Timor, and Indonesia. *The International Journal of Civic, Political, and Community Studies* 16: 1–11. [CrossRef]

Del Castillo, Fides. 2020. Health, spirituality and Covid-19: Themes and insights. *Journal of Public Health*, fdaa185. [CrossRef]

Del Castillo, Fides, and Marie Alino. 2020. Religious Coping of Selected Filipino Catholic Youth. *Religions* 11: 462. [CrossRef]

Del Castillo, Fides, and Clarence Darro B del Castillo. 2020. Lessons from COVID19: Advocacy toward the vulnerable. *Journal of Public Health*, fdaa121. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Demmrich, Sarah. 2020. How to Measure Baha'i Religiosity: The CRSi-20 for Baha'is as a First Reliable and Valid Measurement. *Religions* 11: 29. [CrossRef]

Dy, Aristotle. 2012. Chinese Buddhism and ethnic identity in Catholic Philippines. *Contemporary Buddhism* 13: 241–62. [CrossRef]

Esperandio, Mary Rute Gomes, Hartmut August, Juan José Camou Viacava, Stefan Huber, and Márcio Luiz Fernandes. 2019. Brazilian Validation of Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS-10BR and CRS-5BR). *Religions* 10: 508. [CrossRef]

Gheorghe, Huza. 2019. The psychometric properties of a Romanian Version of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS 15). *Religions* 10: 11. [CrossRef]

Good, Marie, Teena Willoughby, and Michael Busseri. 2011. Stability and change in adolescent spirituality/religiosity: A person-centered approach. *Developmental Psychology* 47: 538–50. [CrossRef]

Hair, Joseph F., Thomas M. Hult, Christian M. Ringle, and Marko Sarstedt. 2014. *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Newbury Park: SAGE.

Hardy, Sam, and Pamela King. 2019. Processes of Religious and Spiritual Influence in Adolescence: Introduction to a Special Section. *Journal of Research on Adolescence (Wiley-Blackwell)* 29: 244–53. [CrossRef]

Hechanova, Regina, and Lynn Waelde. 2017. The influence of culture on disaster mental health and psychosocial support interventions in Southeast Asia, Mental Health. *Religion & Culture* 20: 31–44.

Hechanova, Regina, Pia Anna Ramos, and Lynn Waelde. 2015. Group-based mindfulness-informed psychological first aid after Typhoon Haiyan. *Disaster Prevention and Management* 24: 610–18. [CrossRef]

Hood, Ralph, Peter Hill, and Bernard Spilka. 2009. *Psychology of Religion*, 4th ed. New York: Guilford Press.

Huber, Stefan. 2007. Are Religious Beliefs Relevant In Daily Life? In *Religion Inside and Outside Traditional Institutions*. Edited by J. van der Ven. Leiden: Brill Publications, pp. 209–30.

Huber, Stefan, and Odilo Huber. 2012. The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). *Religions* 3: 710–24. [CrossRef]

Hutter, Manfred. 2012. "Half Mandir and half Gurdwara": Three local Hindu communities in Manila, Jakarta, and Cologne. *Numen* 59: 344–65. [CrossRef]

JASP Team. 2020. JASP (Version 0.14) [Computer Software]. Available online: https://jasp-stats.org (accessed on 26 October 2020).

John, Paul, II. 1981. Message of His Holiness John Paul II to the President and the People of the Philippines. Available online: http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paulii/en/speeches/1981/february/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19810217_manila-presidente.html (accessed on 26 October 2020).

Kline, Rex B. 2005. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: Gilford Press.

Koenig, Harold. 2012. Religion, Spirituality, and Health: The Research and Clinical Implications. *ISRN Psychiatry* 2012: 278730. [CrossRef]

Lee, John Chi-Kin, and Xiaoxue Kuang. 2020. Validation of the Chinese Version of the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS): Teacher Perspectives. *Religions* 11: 266. [CrossRef]

Macaraan, Willard. 2019. A kapwa-infused paradigm in teaching Catholic theology/catechesis in a multireligious classroom in the Philippines. *Teaching Theology and Religion* 22: 102–13. [CrossRef]

Macasaet, Marty. 2009. The spiritual journey of young Filipinos. In *The Y Factor: 2009 Yearbook on the Filipino Youth*. Edited by G. Leung. Makati: Salesian Missions, pp. 10–15.

Mardia, Kanti V. 1970. Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika* 57: 519–30. [CrossRef]

Nakonz, Jonas, and Angela Shik. 2009. And all your problems are gone: Religious coping strategies among Philippine migrant workers in Hong Kong. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 12: 25–38.

Pargament, Kenneth, Harold Koenig, and Lisa Perez. 2000. The many methods of religious coping: Development and initial validation of the RCOPE. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 56: 519–44. [CrossRef]

Philippine Statistics Authority. 2017. Results from the 2015 Census of Population. Available online: https://psa.gov.ph/population-and-housing/node/120080 (accessed on 20 October 2020).

Philippines: Society and Culture, 2nd ed. 2011. Traverse City: World Trade Press.

Rilveria, John Robert. 2018. The development of the Filipino coping strategies scale. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review* 18: 111–26.

Sapitula, Manuel, and Jayeel Cornelio. 2014. Foreword To The Special Issue: A Religious Society? Advancing the Sociology of Religion in the Philippines. *Philippine Sociological Review* 62: 1–9. Available online: http://www.jstor.org/stable/43486490 (accessed on 21 October 2020).

Talik, Elizabeth. 2013. The adolescent Religious Coping Questionnaire. Translation and cultural adaptation of Pargament's RCOPE Scale for Polish adolescents. *Journal of Religion and Health* 52: 143–58. [CrossRef]

Youth in Nation Building Act. 1995. Available online: http://nyc.gov.ph/republic-act-8044/ (accessed on 19 October 2020).

Yung, Yiu-Fai, and Peter M. Bentler. 1996. Bootstrapping techniques in analysis of mean and covariance structures. In *Advancaced Structural Equation Modeling: Issues and Techniques*. Edited by G. A. Marcoulides and R. E. Schumaker. Mahwah: Erbaum, pp. 195–226.